IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 18213 of 2004

Between:

Smt. Chitikela Varahalamma, W/o. Sri Chitikela

Venkataramana,
R/o. Agency Lakshmipuram (V), Golugonda Mandal,

Visakhapatnam District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Circle Inspector, P.S. Koyyuru,
Visakhapatnam District.
2 Sub-Inspector of Police, P.S. Koyyuru,
Visakhapatnam District.
3 Lagudu Krishna Murthi, S/o. late Sri Lagudu Kannaiah,
R/o. Agency Lakshmipuram(V), Golugonda Mandal,
Visakhapatnam District.
4 Lagudu Nageswara Rao, S/o. Lagudu Krishna Murthi,
R/o. Agency Lakshmipuram(V), Golugonda Mandal,
Visakhapatnam District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High

Court will be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 1st and 2nd respondents in not taking any action on the petitioners complaint dt. 21-9-2004 against the 3rd and 4th respondents and not providing police protection to the petitioner and her property is illegal, arbitrary and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to take immediate action against the 3rd and 4th respondent.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.CH.RAVINDER

Counsel for the Respondents 1 and 2: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

The petitioner states that she lodged a complaint to the 1st and 2nd respondents on 21-09-2004, complaining that the 3rd and 4th respondents have been interfering with her lawful possession in respect of Ac.2.07 cents of land in S.No.39/2 of Laksmipuram village, Visakhapatnam District and threatening her with dire consequences and therefore requesting to take necessary action and also to provide protection to her life and property. The only grievance of the petitioner is that respondents 1 and 2 failed to consider the said complaint so far.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, without expressing any opinion with regard to the correctness of the allegations made by the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition, with a direction to the respondents 1 and 2, to consider the complaint made by the petitioner dated 21-09-2004, and to take necessary steps in accordance with law.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

14-10-2004

Note: Issue C.C in two days.

B/o.

vs

To

1 The Circle Inspector, P.S. Koyyuru,
Visakhapatnam District.
2 The Sub-Inspector of Police, P.S. Koyyuru,
Visakhapatnam District.
3 2CCs to the G.P for Home, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.
(O.U.T)

4 2CD copies